



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,662	01/24/2002	John Baird	P84-US4	9661

20988 7590 04/18/2003

OGILVY RENAULT
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE
SUITE 1600
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3
CANADA

EXAMINER

MAYES, LAURIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1653

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/053,662

Applicant(s)

BAIRD ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Mayes

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, 9-11, 15, drawn to polynucleotides, nucleic acid constructs and a kit comprising polynucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1 and a method of making a protein by recombinant means, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 6-8, drawn to equine laminin, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claims 12-14 and 19, drawn to a method of diagnosing epidermolysis bullosa by identifying the presence of laminin-encoding nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- IV. Claims 17, 18 and 20, drawn to a method of diagnosing JEB comprising screening for laminin, classified in class 436, subclass 15.
- V. Claim 16, drawn to antibodies, classified in class 530/387.1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case recombinant means may be used to make other proteins with different structures and functions. Also, equine laminin is naturally occurring in nature and therefore is made by another, non-recombinant means.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide could be used in a materially different process than a method of diagnosing epidermolysis bullosa by isolating, amplifying and analyzing the polynucleotide such as to encode a protein.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention I is a method of making nucleic acids using nucleic acid constructs and recombinant methods while Invention IV is a method of diagnosing JEB in a horse comprising screening a sample for the laminin peptide and does not involve nucleic acids. These methods have different modes of operation and different functions.

Inventions I and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention I is comprised of a polynucleotide and means for making a polynucleotide that encodes equine laminin while Invention V comprises an antibody that does not comprise the polynucleotide nor is it used to make equine laminin. Rather, the antibody is directed against equine laminin.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different

Art Unit: 1653

functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention II is a protein while Invention III comprises a method of diagnosing bullosa by isolating and amplifying nucleic acid. The protein in Invention II is not used in the method of Invention III.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, laminin is used in a different process as it is found naturally occurring in the body.

Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention II is a protein while Invention V comprises an antibody that is directed against that protein. Thus, Inventions II and V are patentably distinct and/ or independent products.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention III is a method of diagnosing bullosa by isolating and amplifying nucleic acids to identify the presence of laminin while Invention IV is a method of diagnosing JEB by isolating and screening for a peptide, laminin. These methods have different modes of operation and different functions.

Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different

Art Unit: 1653

functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention III is drawn to a method of using a polynucleotide to diagnose bullosa while Invention V is an antibody that does not comprise the polynucleotide nor is it used to diagnose bullosa. Rather, the antibody is directed against a polypeptide, equine laminin.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention IV is comprised of a method of using a protein to diagnose JEB while Invention V comprises an antibody that is directed against that protein.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and searches required for each, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call was made to Susan Tandan on April 16, 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Mayes whose telephone number is (703) 605-1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7 AM to 3:30 PM.

Art Unit: 1653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (703) 305-2923. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3014 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1123.

Laurie Mayes
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1653
April 16, 2003

Christopher S. Low
C.S. LOW
SUPERVISOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600